

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Objection was made to claims 9, 18, and 22. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 18, and 22 have been amended to overcome the objection.

Objection was made to claims 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 23. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 23 have been amended to overcome the objection.

Claim 18, and, by dependency, claims 19-21, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 has been amended, in clause b. thereof, to overcome the rejection, based on a telephonic interview with the Examiner on May 18, 2011.

Claims 9, 16, 18, and 22, and, by dependency, claims 10-12, 19-20, and 23, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 16, 18, and 22 have been amended to overcome the rejection. In particular, the rejection of claim 9, based on the term “the fluid,” (see Office Action, pages 5-6), has been overcome by replacing “the fluid” on lines 10-11 of the claim with --a material into the double-cone device--. Antecedent basis for this change to claim 9 is found in the specification, for example, on page 10, lines 1-18. A change similar to the change made to claim 9 has been made to claims 18 and 22.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

Claim 18 was rejected again under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, in section 12, on page 8, of the Office Action. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner agreed, in the telephonic interview on May 18, 2011, that this rejection should have been a rejection of claim 22.

Claim 22 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claims 9, 18, and 22, and, by dependency, claims 10-12, 19-21, and 23, were stated to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action. The Examiner agreed, in the telephonic interview of May 18, 2011, that claim 16 was inadvertently omitted from the list of claims which were indicated to be allowable.

Claims 9-12, 16, and 18-23 have been amended to overcome the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 9-12, 16, and 18-23 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael I. Markowitz
Registration No.: 30,659
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF/MIM:lac